```
1
    E. MARTIN ESTRADA
    United States Attorney
    MACK E. JENKINS
 2
    Assistant United States Attorney
 3
    Chief, Criminal Division
    SCOTT PAETTY (Cal. Bar No. 274719)
 4
    Assistant United States Attorney
    Deputy Chief, Major Frauds Section
    ALI MOGHADDAS (Cal. Bar No. 305654)
    Assistant United States Attorney
 6
    Major Frauds Section
         1100 United States Courthouse
 7
         312 North Spring Street
         Los Angeles, California 90012
         Telephone: (213) 894-6527/1786
 8
         Facsimile: (213) 894-6269
 9
         E-mail:
                     scott.paetty/ali.moghaddas@usdoj.gov
10
    Attorneys for Plaintiff
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
11
                         UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12
                    FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                        No. CR 23-00047-JLS
14
              Plaintiff,
                                        GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT
15
                                        GIRARDI'S EX PARTE APPLICATION TO
                                        SET BRIEFING SCHEDULE ON
                   v.
16
                                        CHRISTOPHER KAMON'S MOTION TO
    THOMAS VINCENT GIRARDI and
                                        EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OF OTHER ACTS
17
    CHRISTOPHER KAZUO KAMON,
18
              Defendants.
19
20
         Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel
21
    of record, the United States Attorney for the Central District of
22
    California and Assistant United States Attorneys Scott Paetty and Ali
23
    Moghaddas, hereby files its response to defendant Girardi's ex parte
24
    application to set briefing schedule on Christopher Kamon's motion to
25
    exclude evidence of other acts (Dkt. 190).
26
    //
27
    //
28
```

## 

This response is based upon the attached memorandum of points and authorities, the files and records in this case, and such further evidence and argument as the Court may permit. Dated: May 27, 2024 Respectfully submitted, E. MARTIN ESTRADA United States Attorney MACK E. JENKINS Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Criminal Division /s/ SCOTT PAETTY ALI MOGHADDAS Assistant United States Attorneys Attorneys for Plaintiff UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Defendant Girardi applies ex parte for a briefing schedule on defendant Kamon's motion to exclude other acts evidence (Dkt. 190), which defendant Kamon filed on May 23, 2024 (Dkt. 189). Defendant Kamon's motion was in response to the government's Rule 404(b) notice to introduce such evidence at trial against defendant Kamon. (See Dkt. 191-1.) Specifically, on February 28, 2024, the government gave notice to the defense that it intended to introduce evidence of defendant Kamon's separate fraud, as charged in Case No. 23-CR-24-JLS, as inextricably intertwined evidence and/or relevant evidence pursuant to Rule 404(b). (Id.) As articulated in the government's notice, evidence of defendant Kamon's separate theft of monies from the Girardi Keese law firm, which the government alleges was done unbeknownst to defendant Girardi, is directly relevant to proving, inter alia, defendant Kamon's motive, knowledge, and intent in the overall scheme charged in Case No. 23-CR-47-JLS. (Id. at 2.) the government's theory, in part, that defendant Kamon was complicit in defendant Girardi's theft and misappropriation of client settlement funds given defendant Kamon's access to Girardi Keese's accounts, which he surreptitiously stole and used for his own illicit gain.

Based on prior meet and confers on this topic, the government understood that defendant Kamon intended to file a motion to exclude this evidence (or the government would alternatively file a motion

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

<sup>26</sup> 

<sup>28</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Defendant Kamon filed an amended motion on May 27, 2024 (Dkt. 191) that contained no substantive changes and only added a certificate of compliance.

for its admission).<sup>2</sup> The government also understood that defendant Girardi would seek to separately introduce such evidence at trial as well, although the government would oppose the admissibility of such evidence in any trial against defendant Girardi only, if the case is severed over the government's objection.<sup>3</sup>

Given the current schedule, and that the Court is already set to hear argument on the pending motions related to the juror questionnaire (Dkt. 186) and Dr. Chui (Dkt. 188) on June 20, the government believes that the briefing schedule and argument should remain joined with the pending motions. The current schedule is more efficient and provides sufficient time for the parties to incorporate the Court's ruling, which will impact the government's case-in-chief and defendants' respective trial strategies. Conversely, holding a third hearing, as proposed by defendant Girardi, (see Dkt. 190 at 2 (requesting a third, separate hearing on July 5 or 12, in addition to the presently scheduled hearing on June 20 and the existing hearing on pretrial motions on July 26)), only serves to unnecessarily expend resources and delay these proceedings.

19 | //

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The parties did not engage in discussions on whether defendant Kamon intended to file his motion by the motion's deadline or sooner.

<sup>3</sup> The government should be allowed to introduce this evidence against defendant Kamon for the reasons stated above, and in its forthcoming opposition to defendant Kamon's motion. However, defendant Girardi does not have any legitimate basis to introduce this evidence, especially in a trial without defendant Kamon, as it would only serve to mislead the jury and obfuscate defendant Girardi's role in the larger scheme. Indeed, evidence that defendant Kamon surreptitiously stole money from Girardi Keese at the same time that defendant Girardi was deceiving clients through false and misleading letters, emails, and voicemails neither mitigates nor exculpates defendant Girardi's conduct. As previously noted, defendant Girardi was unaware of defendant Kamon's separate theft. Thus, this evidence has no relevance to defendant Girardi's culpability (or purported lack thereof).

## 

Accordingly, it is the government's preference to keep defendant Kamon's motion (Dkt. 191) on calendar for June 20, 2024, the same date the Court intends to consider the parties' additional pending motions, and that any opposition to defendant Kamon's motion should be filed by the current deadline, i.e., May 31, 2024.